

OCT 10 2007

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

AURELIANO CABRERA; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

PETER D. KEISLER,** Acting Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 07-71687

Agency Nos. A79-524-174
A79-524-175

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted October 1, 2007 ***

Before: B. FLETCHER, BERZON and IKUTA, Circuit Judges.

This is a petition for review from the Board of Immigration Appeals’
 (“BIA”) denial of a motion to reopen.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** Peter D. Keisler is substituted for his predecessor, Alberto R. Gonzales, as Acting Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 43(c)(2).

*** This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Respondent's unopposed motion for summary disposition is granted because the questions raised by this petition for review are so insubstantial as not to require further argument. *See United States v. Hooton*, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (per curiam) (stating standard). The regulations provide that "a party may file only one motion to reopen," and that the motion "must be filed no later than 90 days after the date on which the final administrative decision was rendered in the proceeding sought to be reopened." *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2). The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reopen, filed more than four months after final administrative decision was rendered. *See Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003). Accordingly, this petition for review is denied.

All other pending motions are denied as moot.

The temporary stay of removal shall continue in effect until issuance of the mandate. The motion for stay of voluntary departure, filed after the departure period had expired, is denied. *See Garcia v. Ashcroft*, 368 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2004).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.